

M. W. Kalinowski

(Higher Vocational State School in Chełm, Poland)

A Hierarchy of Symmetry Breaking in the Nonsymmetric Kaluza–Klein (Jordan–Thiry) Theory

Abstract. The paper is devoted to the hierarchy of a symmetry breaking in the Nonsymmetric Kaluza–Klein (Jordan–Thiry) Theory. The basic idea consists in a deformation of a vacuum states manifold to the cartesian product of vacuum states manifolds of every stage of a symmetry breaking.

In the paper we consider a pattern of a spontaneous symmetry breaking including a hierarchy in the Nonsymmetric Kaluza–Klein (Jordan–Thiry) Theory. We refer for all details to Ref. [1], especially to the book on nonsymmetric field theory.

Let us incorporate in our scheme a hierarchy of a symmetry breaking. In order to do this let us consider a case of the manifold

$$M = M_0 \times M_1 \times \dots \times M_{k-1} \quad (1)$$

where

$$\dim M_i = \bar{n}_i, \quad i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, k-1$$

$$\dim M = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \bar{n}_i, \quad (2)$$

$$M_i = G_{i+1}/G_i. \quad (3)$$

Every manifold M_i is a manifold of vacuum states if the symmetry is breaking from G_{i+1} to G_i , $G_k = G$.

Thus

$$G_0 \subset G_1 \subset G_2 \subset \dots \subset G_k = G. \quad (4)$$

We will consider the situation when

$$M \simeq G/G_0. \quad (5)$$

This is a constraint in the theory. From the chain (4) one gets

$$\mathfrak{g}_0 \subset \mathfrak{g}_1 \subset \dots \subset \mathfrak{g}_k = \mathfrak{g} \quad (6)$$

and

$$\mathfrak{g}_{i+1} = \mathfrak{g}_i + \mathfrak{m}_i, \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, k. \quad (7)$$

The relation (5) means that there is a diffeomorphism g onto G/G_0 such that

$$g : \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} (G_{i+1}/G_i) \rightarrow G/G_0. \quad (8)$$

This diffeomorphism is a deformation of a product (1) in G/G_0 . The theory has been constructed for the case considered before with G_0 and G . The multiplet of Higgs' fields Φ breaks the symmetry from G to G_0 (equivalently from G to G'_0 in the false vacuum case). $\mathfrak{g}_i$ mean Lie algebras for groups G_i and $\mathfrak{m}_i$ a complement in a decomposition (7). On every manifold M_i we introduce a radius r_i (a "size" of a manifold) in such a way that $r_i > r_{i+1}$. On the manifold G/G_0 we define the radius r as before. The diffeomorphism g induces a contragradient transformation for a Higgs field Φ in such a way that

$$g^* \Phi = (\Phi_0, \Phi_1, \dots, \Phi_{k-1}). \quad (9)$$

The fields Φ_i , $i = 0, \dots, k-1$.

In this way we get the following decomposition for a kinetic part of the field Φ and for a potential of this field:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{kin}}(\overset{\text{gauge}}{\nabla} \Phi) = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \mathcal{L}_{\text{kin}}^i(\overset{\text{gauge}}{\nabla} \Phi_i) \quad (10)$$

$$V(\Phi) = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} V^i(\Phi_i) \quad (11)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{kin}}^i(\overset{\text{gauge}}{\nabla} \Phi_i) = \frac{1}{V_i} \int_{M_i} \sqrt{|\tilde{g}_i|} d^{\bar{n}_i} x \left(l_{ab} g_i^{\tilde{b}_i \tilde{n}_i} L_{\tilde{b}_i}^{a\mu} \overset{\text{gauge}}{\nabla}_\mu \Phi_{i\tilde{n}_i}^b \right) \quad (12)$$

where

$$V_i = \int_{M_i} \sqrt{|\tilde{g}_i|} d^{\bar{n}_i} x \quad (13)$$

$$\tilde{g}_i = \det(g_{i\tilde{b}_i \tilde{a}_i}). \quad (14)$$

$g_{i\tilde{b}_i \tilde{a}_i}$ is a nonsymmetric tensor on a manifold M_i .

$$\begin{aligned} V^i(\Phi_i) = & \frac{l_{ab}}{V_i} \int_{M_i} \sqrt{|\tilde{g}_i|} d^{\bar{n}_i} x \left[2g^{[\tilde{m}_i \tilde{n}_i]} \left(C_{cd}^a \Phi_{i\tilde{m}_i}^c \Phi_{i\tilde{n}_i}^d - \mu_{\tilde{a}_i}^a f_{\tilde{m}_i \tilde{n}_i}^{\hat{i}_i} - \Phi_{i\tilde{e}_i}^a f_{\tilde{m}_i \tilde{n}_i}^{\tilde{e}_i} \right) \right. \\ & \times g^{[\tilde{a}_i \tilde{b}_i]} \left(C_{ef}^b \Phi_{i\tilde{a}_i}^e \Phi_{i\tilde{b}_i}^f - \mu_{\tilde{j}_i}^b f_{\tilde{a}_i \tilde{b}_i}^{\hat{j}_i} - \Phi_{i\tilde{a}_i}^b f_{\tilde{b}_i \tilde{c}_i}^{\tilde{d}_i} \right) \\ & \left. - g_{\tilde{a}_i \tilde{m}_i}^{\tilde{a}_i} g_{\tilde{b}_i \tilde{n}_i}^{\tilde{b}_i} L_{\tilde{a}_i \tilde{b}_i}^a \left(C_{cd}^b \Phi_{i\tilde{m}_i}^c \Phi_{i\tilde{n}_i}^d - \mu_{\tilde{i}_i}^b f_{\tilde{m}_i \tilde{n}_i}^{\hat{i}_i} - \Phi_{i\tilde{e}_i}^b f_{\tilde{m}_i \tilde{n}_i}^{\tilde{e}_i} \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

$f_{\tilde{a}_i \tilde{b}_i}^{\hat{j}_i}$ are structure constants of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}_i$.

The scheme of the symmetry breaking acts as follows from the group G_{i+1} to G_i (G'_i) (if the symmetry has been broken up to G_{i+1}). The potential $V^i(\Phi_i)$ has a minimum (global or local) for Φ_{crt}^k , $k = 0, 1$. The value of the remaining part of the sum (11) for fields Φ_j , $j < i$, is small for the scale of energy is much lower ($r_j > r_i$, $j < i$). Thus the minimum of $V^i(\Phi_i)$ is an approximate minimum of the remaining part of the sum (11). In this way we have a descending chain of truncations of the Higgs potential. This gives in principle a pattern of a symmetry breaking. However, this is only an approximate symmetry breaking. The real symmetry breaking is from G to G_0 (or to G'_0 in a false vacuum case). The important point here is the diffeomorphism g .

$$g^* \Phi^b = (\Phi_0^b, \Phi_1^b, \dots, \Phi_{k-1}^b) \quad (16)$$

$$\Phi_i^b = \Phi_{i\tilde{a}_i}^b \tilde{\theta}^{\tilde{a}_i}, \quad i = 0, \dots, k-1. \quad (17)$$

The shape of g is a true indicator of a reality of the symmetry breaking pattern. If

$$g = \text{Id} + \delta g \quad (18)$$

where δg is in some sense small and Id is an identity, the sums (10–11) are close to the formulae (5.4.22) and (5.4.23) from the first point of Ref. [1], p. 344. The smallness of δg is a criterion of a practical application of the symmetry breaking pattern (4). It seems that there are a lot of possibilities for the condition (8). Moreover, a smallness of δg plus some natural conditions for groups G_i can narrow looking for grand unified models. Let us notice that the decomposition of M results in decomposition of cosmological terms

$$\tilde{\underline{P}} = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \tilde{\underline{P}}_i \quad (19)$$

where

$$\tilde{\underline{P}}_i = \frac{1}{r_i^2 V_i} \int_{M_i} \sqrt{|\tilde{g}_i|} \hat{R}_i(\hat{\Gamma}_i) d^{n_i} x \quad (20)$$

where $\hat{\Gamma}_i$ is a nonsymmetric connection on M_i compatible with the nonsymmetric tensor $g_{i\tilde{a}_i \tilde{b}_i}$ and $\hat{R}_i(\hat{\Gamma}_i)$ its curvature scalar. The scalar field Ψ is now a function on a product of M_i ,

$$\Psi = \Psi(x, y_0, \dots, y_{k-1}), \quad y_i \in M_i, \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1.$$

The truncation procedure can be proceeded in several ways. Finally let us notice that the energy scale of broken gauge bosons is fixed by a radius r_i at any stage of the symmetry breaking in our scheme. The possible groups in our symmetry breaking pattern can be taken from the first part of Ref. [1], pp. 323–324 (see 5.2.62–66).

Let us consider Eq. (9) in more details. One gets

$$A_{i\tilde{a}i}^{\tilde{a}}(y)\Phi_a^b(y) = \Phi_{\tilde{a}i}^b(y_i), \quad y \in M, \quad y_i \in M_i \quad (21)$$

where

$$g^*(y) = \left(A_0 \left| A_1 \right| A_2 \left| \dots \right| A_{k-1} \right), \quad (22)$$

$$A_i = (A_{i\tilde{a}i}^{\tilde{a}})_{\tilde{a}=1,2,\dots,n_1, \tilde{a}_i=1,2,\dots,\tilde{n}_i}, \quad i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, k \quad (23)$$

is a matrix of Higgs' fields transformation.

According to our assumptions one gets also:

$$\left(\frac{r_i}{r} \right)^2 g_{i\tilde{a}i\tilde{b}i}(y_i) = A_{\tilde{a}i}^{\tilde{a}}(y) A_{\tilde{b}i}^{\tilde{b}}(y) g_{\tilde{a}\tilde{b}}(y). \quad (24)$$

For g is an invertible map we have $\det g^*(y) \neq 0$.

We have also

$$n_1 = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \tilde{n}_i \quad (25)$$

and

$$\Phi_a^b(y) = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \tilde{A}_{i\tilde{a}i}^{\tilde{a}}(y) \Phi_{\tilde{a}i}^b(y_i) \quad (26)$$

or

$$g^{*-1}(y) = \left(\frac{\tilde{A}_0}{\tilde{A}_1} \right) \left(\frac{\tilde{A}_1}{\vdots} \right) \left(\frac{\vdots}{\tilde{A}_{k-1}} \right) \quad (27)$$

$$\tilde{A}_i = (\tilde{A}_{i\tilde{a}i}^{\tilde{a}})_{\tilde{a}_i=1,2,\dots,\tilde{n}_i, \tilde{a}=1,2,\dots,n_1} \quad (28)$$

such that

$$g(y_0, \dots, y_{k-1}) = y \quad (29)$$

$$(y_0, y_1, \dots, y_{k-1}) = g^{-1}(y) \quad (29a)$$

For an inverse tensor $g^{\tilde{a}\tilde{b}}$ one easily gets

$$\left(\frac{r_i^2}{r^2} \right) g^{\tilde{a}\tilde{b}} = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \tilde{A}_{i\tilde{a}i}^{\tilde{a}} g_i^{\tilde{a}_i\tilde{b}_i} A_{i\tilde{b}i}^{\tilde{b}}. \quad (30)$$

We have

$$r^{2n_1} \det(g_{\tilde{a}\tilde{b}}) = \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} r_i^{2\tilde{n}_i} \det(g_{i\tilde{a}_i\tilde{b}_i}). \quad (31)$$

In this way we have for the measure

$$d\mu(y) = \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} d\mu_i(y_i) \quad (32)$$

where

$$d\mu(y) = \sqrt{\det g} r^{n_1} d^{n_1} y \quad (33)$$

$$d\mu_i(y_i) = \sqrt{\det g_i} r_i^{\tilde{n}_i} d^{\tilde{n}_i} y_i. \quad (34)$$

In the case of $\mathcal{L}_{\text{int}}(\Phi, \tilde{A})$ one gets

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{int}}(\Phi, \tilde{A}) = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \mathcal{L}_{\text{int}}(\Phi_i, \tilde{A}) \quad (35)$$

where

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{int}}(\Phi_i, \tilde{A}) = h_{ab} \mu_{\underline{i}}^a \tilde{H}^i \underline{g}_i^{[\tilde{a}_i \tilde{b}_i]} \left(C_{cd}^b \Phi_{i\tilde{a}_i}^c \Phi_{i\tilde{b}_i}^d - \mu_{\tilde{i}}^b f_{\tilde{a}_i \tilde{b}_i}^{\tilde{i}} - \Phi_{\tilde{a}_i}^b f_{\tilde{a}_i \tilde{b}_i}^{\tilde{d}_i} \right) \quad (36)$$

where

$$\underline{g}_i^{[\tilde{a}_i \tilde{b}_i]} = \frac{1}{V_i} \int_{M_i} \sqrt{|\tilde{g}_i|} d^{\tilde{n}_i} x g_i^{[\tilde{a}_i \tilde{b}_i]}, \quad i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, k-1. \quad (37)$$

Moreover, to be in line in the full theory we should consider a chain of groups H_i , $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, k-1$, in such a way that

$$H_0 \subset H_1 \subset H_2 \subset \dots \subset H_{k-1} = H. \quad (38)$$

For every group H_i we have the following assumptions

$$G_i \subset H_i \quad (39)$$

and G_{i+1} is a centralizer of G_i in H_i . Thus we should have

$$G_i \otimes G_{i+1} \subset H_i, \quad i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, k-1. \quad (40)$$

We know from elementary particles physics theory that

$$\begin{aligned} G_0 &= U_{\text{el}} \otimes SU(3)_{\text{color}}, \\ G_1 &= SU(2)_{\text{L}} \otimes U(1)_{\text{Y}} \otimes SU(3)_{\text{color}} \end{aligned}$$

and that G_2 is a group which plays the role of H in the case of a symmetry breaking from $SU(2)_L \otimes U_Y(1)$ to $U_{\text{el}}(1)$. However, in this case because of a factor $U(1)$, $M = S^2$. Thus $M_0 = S^2$ and $G_2 \subset H_0$.

It seems that in a reality we have to do with two more stages of a symmetry breaking. Thus $k = 3$. We have

$$M \simeq S^2 \times M_1 \times M_2 \quad (41)$$

$$M = G/(U(1) \otimes SU(3)) \quad (42)$$

$$M_1 = G_1/(SU(2) \times U(1) \times SU(3))$$

$$U(1) \otimes SU(3) \subset SU(2) \otimes U(1) \otimes SU(3) \subset G_2 \otimes SU(3) \subset G_3 = G \quad (43)$$

and

$$G_1 \subset H_1 \subset H \quad (44)$$

$$U(1) \otimes SU(3) \otimes G \subset H \quad (44a)$$

$$(U(1) \otimes SU(2) \otimes SU(3)) \otimes G_2 \subset H_1 \quad (44b)$$

and

$$G_2 \otimes G \subset H_2 = H \quad (44c)$$

$$M_2 = G/G_1. \quad (45)$$

We can take for G $SU(5)$, $SO(10)$, E_6 or $SU(6)$. Thus there are a lot of choices for G_2 , H_1 and H .

We can suppose for a trial that

$$G_2 \otimes SU(3) \subset H_0. \quad (45a)$$

We have also some additional constraints

$$\text{rank}(G) \geq 4. \quad (45b)$$

Thus

$$\text{rank}(H_0) \geq 4. \quad (45c)$$

We can try with $F_4 = H_0$.

In the case of H

$$\text{rank}(H) \geq \text{rank}(G) + 3 \geq 7. \quad (45d)$$

Thus we can try with E_7 , E_8

$$\text{rank}(H_1) \geq \text{rank}(G_2) + 4$$

$$\text{rank}(H) \geq \text{rank}(G_2) + \text{rank}(G) \geq \text{rank}(G_2) + 4 \geq \text{rank}(G) + 4 \geq 8. \quad (45e)$$

In this way we have

$$\text{rank}(H) \geq 8. \quad (45f)$$

Thus we can try with

$$H = E8. \quad (45g)$$

But in this case

$$\text{rank}(G_2) = \text{rank}(G) = 4.$$

This seems to be nonrealistic. For instance, if $G = SO(10)$, $E6$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rank}(SO(10)) &= 5 \\ \text{rank } E6 &= 6. \end{aligned}$$

In this case we get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rank}(H) &= 9 \\ \text{rank}(H) &= 10 \end{aligned}$$

and H could be $SU(10)$, $SO(18)$, $SO(20)$.

In this approach we try to consider additional dimensions connecting to the manifold M more seriously, i.e. as physical dimensions, additional space-like dimensions. We remind to the reader that gauge-dimensions connecting to the group H have different meaning. They are dimensions connected to local gauge symmetries (or global) and they cannot be directly observed. Simply saying we cannot travel along them. In the case of a manifold M this possibility still exists. However, the manifold M is diffeomorphically equivalent to the product of some manifolds M_i , $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, k-1$, with some characteristic sizes r_i .

The radii r_i represent energy scales of symmetry breaking. The lowest energy scale is a scale of weak interactions (Weinberg-Glashow-Salam model) $r_0 \simeq 10^{-16}$ cm. In this case this is a radius of a sphere S^2 . The possibility of this “travel” will be considered in Ref. [2]. In this case a metric on a manifold M can be dependent on a point $x \in E$ (parametrically).

It is interesting to ask on a stability of a symmetry breaking pattern with respect to quantum fluctuations. This difficult problem strongly depends on the details of the model. Especially on the Higgs sector of the practical model. In order to preserve this stability on every stage of the symmetry breaking we should consider remaining Higgs’ fields (after symmetry breaking) with zero mass. According to S. Weinberg, they can stabilize the symmetry breaking in the range of energy

$$\frac{1}{r_i} \left(\frac{\hbar}{c} \right) < E < \frac{1}{r_{i+1}} \left(\frac{\hbar}{c} \right), \quad i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, k-1, \quad (46)$$

i.e. for a symmetry breaking from G_{i+1} to G_i .

It seems that in order to create a realistic grand unified model based on nonsymmetric Kaluza–Klein (Jordan–Thiry) theory it is necessary to nivel cosmological terms.

This could be achieved in some models due to choosing constants ξ and ζ and μ . After this we can control the value of those terms, which are considered as a selfinteraction potential of a scalar field Ψ . The scalar field Ψ can play in this context a role of a quintessence.

Let us notice that using the equation

$$\Phi_b^c(x) f_{\hat{a}}^{\tilde{b}} = \mu_{\hat{a}}^a \Phi_{\tilde{a}}^b(x) C_{ab}^c, \quad (*)$$

and (26) one gets

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \tilde{A}_{ib}^{\tilde{a}_i} \Phi_{\tilde{a}_i}^c f_{\hat{a}}^{\tilde{b}} = C_{ab}^c \mu_{\hat{a}}^a \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \tilde{A}_{ia}^{\tilde{a}_i} \Phi_{\tilde{a}_i}^b. \quad (47)$$

In this way we get constraints for Higgs' fields $\Phi_0, \Phi_1, \dots, \Phi_{k-1}$,

$$\Phi_i = (\Phi_{\tilde{a}_i}^b), \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1.$$

Solving these constraints we obtain some of Higgs' fields as functions of independent components. This could result in some cross terms in the potential (11) between Φ 's with different i . For example a term

$$V(\Phi'_i, \Phi'_j),$$

where Φ' means independent fields. This can cause some problems in a stability of symmetry breaking pattern against radiative corrections. This can be easily seen from Eq. (*) solved by independent Φ' ,

$$\Phi = B\Phi' \quad (48)$$

$$\Phi_b^c = B_{\tilde{b}\tilde{c}}^{c\tilde{b}} \Phi'_{\tilde{b}}^{\tilde{c}} \quad (49)$$

where B is a linear operator transforming independent Φ' into Φ .

We can suppose for a trial a condition similar to (*) for every $i = 0, \dots, k-1$,

$$\Phi_{\tilde{b}_i}^{c_i} f_{\hat{a}_i}^{\tilde{b}_i} = \mu_{\hat{a}_i}^{a_i} \Phi_{\tilde{a}_i}^{b_i} C_{a_i b_i}^{c_i} \quad (50)$$

where $C_{a_i b_i}^{c_i}$ are structure constants for the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{h}_i$ of the group H_i . $f_{\hat{a}_i}^{\tilde{b}_i}$ are structure constants of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}_{i+1}$, $\hat{a}_i$ are indices belonging to Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}_i$ and $\tilde{a}_i$ to the complement $\mathfrak{m}_i$.

In this way

$$\Phi_{\tilde{b}_i}^c = \Phi_{\tilde{b}_i}^{c_i} \delta_{c_i}^c. \quad (51)$$

In this case we should have a consistency between (50) and (47) which impose constraints on C, f, μ and C^i, f^i, μ^i where C^i, f^i, μ^i refer to H_i, G_{i+1} . Solving (50) via introducing independent fields Φ'_i one gets

$$\Phi_{ib_i}^{c_i} = B_{i\tilde{c}_i \tilde{b}_i}^{c_i \tilde{b}_i} \Phi'_{i\tilde{b}_i}^{\tilde{c}_i}. \quad (52)$$

Combining (49), (51–52) one gets

$$B_{\tilde{b}\tilde{c}}^{\tilde{c}\tilde{b}}\Phi'_{\tilde{b}} = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \tilde{A}_{ib}^{\tilde{a}_i} \delta_{c_i}^c B_{i\tilde{c}_i\tilde{b}_i}^{c_i\tilde{b}_i} \Phi'_{i\tilde{b}_i}{}^{\tilde{c}_i}. \quad (53)$$

Eq. (53) gives a relation between independent Higgs' fields Φ' and Φ'_i . Simultaneously it is a consistency condition between Eq. (*) and Eq. (50). However, the condition (50) seems to be too strong and probably it is necessary to solve a weaker condition (47) which goes to the mentioned terms $V(\Phi'_i, \Phi'_j)$. The conditions (50) plus a consistency (53) avoid those terms in the Higgs potential. This problem demands more investigations.

It seems that the condition (8) could be too strong. In order to find a more general condition we consider a simple example of (4). Let $G_0 = \{e\}$ and $K = 2$. In this case we have

$$\{e\} \subset G_1 \subset G_2 = G \quad (54)$$

$$M_0 = G_1, \quad M_1 = G/G_1 \quad (55)$$

$$g : G_1 \times G/G_1 \rightarrow G. \quad (56)$$

In this way $G_1 \times G/G_1$ is diffeomorphically equivalent to G .

Moreover, we can consider a fibre bundle with base space G/G_1 and a structural group G_1 with a bundle manifold G . This construction is known in the theory of induced group representation (see [3] and section 5.2 of the first point of Ref. [1]). The projection $\varphi : G \rightarrow G/G_1$ is defined by $\varphi(g) = \{gG_1\}$. The natural extension of (56) is to consider a fibre bundle $(G, G/G_1, G_1, \varphi)$. In this way we have in a place of (56) a local condition

$$g_U : G_1 \times U \xrightarrow[\text{in}]{} G \quad (57)$$

where $U \subset G/G_1$ is an open set. Thus in a place of (8) we consider a local diffeomorphism

$$g_U : M_0 \times M_1 \times \dots \times M_{k-1} \xrightarrow[\text{in}]{} G/G_0. \quad (58)$$

where

$$U = U_0 \times U_1 \times \dots \times U_{k-1},$$

$U_i \subset M_i, i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, k-1$, are open sets. Moreover we should define projectors $\varphi_i, i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, k-1$,

$$\varphi_i : G/G_0 \rightarrow G_{i+1}/G_i, \quad (59)$$

i.e.

$$\varphi_i(\{gG_0\}) = \{g_{i+1}G_i\}, \quad (60)$$

$$g \in G, \quad g_{i+1} \in G_{i+1}, \quad G_0 \subset G_i \subset G_{i+1} \subset G$$

in a unique way. This could give us a fibration of G/G_0 in $\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} (G_{i+1}/G_i)$.

For $g \in G_{i+1}$ we simply define

$$\varphi_i(\{gG_0\}) = \{gG_i\}. \quad (61)$$

If $g \in G$, $g \notin G_{i+1}$, we define

$$\varphi_i(\{gG_0\}) = \{G_i\}. \quad (62)$$

Thus in general

$$\varphi_i(\{gG_0\}) = \{p(g)G_i\} \quad (63)$$

where

$$p(g) = \begin{cases} g, & g \in G_{i+1} \\ e, & g \notin G_{i+1}. \end{cases} \quad (64)$$

Thus in a place of (8) we have to do with a structure

$$\left\{ G/G_0, \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} (G_{i+1}/G_i), \varphi_0, \varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_{k-1} \right\} \quad (65)$$

such that

$$g_U \circ \varphi|_U = \text{id} \quad (66)$$

where

$$\varphi|_U = \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \varphi_{i|U_i}. \quad (67)$$

This generalizes (8) to the local conditions (58). Now we can repeat all the considerations concerning a decomposition of Higgs' fields using local diffeomorphisms g_U (g_U^*) in the place of g (g^*). Let us also notice that in the chain of groups it would be interesting to consider as G_2

$$G_2 = SU(2)_L \otimes SU(2)_R \otimes SU(4)$$

suggested by Salam and Pati, where $SU(4)$ unifies $SU(3)_{\text{color}} \otimes U(1)_Y$. This will be helpful in our future consideration concerning extension to supersymmetric groups, i.e. $U(2,2)$ which unifies $SU(2)_L \otimes SU(2)_R$ to the super Lie group $U(2,2)$ considered by Mohapatra. Such models on the phenomenological level incorporate fermions with a possible extension to the supersymmetric $SO(10)$ model. They give a natural framework for lepton flavour mixing going to the neutrino oscillations incorporating see-saw mechanism for mass generations of neutrinos. In such approaches the see-saw mechanism is coming from the grand unified models. Our approach after incorporating manifolds with anticommuting parameters, super Lie groups, super Lie algebras and in

general supermanifolds (superfibrebundles) can be able to obtain this. However, it is necessary to develop a formalism (in the language of supermanifolds, superfibrebundles, super Lie groups, super Lie algebras) for nonsymmetric connections, nonsymmetric Kaluza–Klein (Jordan–Thiry) theory. In particular we should construct an analogue of Einstein–Kaufmann connection for supermanifold, a nonsymmetric Kaluza–Klein (Jordan–Thiry) theory for superfibrebundle with super Lie group. In this way we should define first of all a nonsymmetric tensor on a super Lie group and afterwards a nonsymmetric metrization of a superfibrebundle.

Let us notice that on every stage of symmetry breaking, i.e. from G_{i+1} to G_i , we have to do with group G'_i (similar to the group G'_0). Thus we can have to do with a true and a false vacuum cases which may complicate a pattern of a symmetry breaking.

References

- [1] Kalinowski M. W., *Nonsymmetric Fields Theory and its Applications*, World Scientific, Singapore, New Jersey, London, Hong Kong 1990.
 Kalinowski M. W., *Can we get confinement from extra dimensions*, in: Physics of Elementary Interactions (ed. Z. Ajduk, S. Pokorski, A. K. Wróblewski), World Scientific, Singapore, New Jersey, London, Hong Kong 1991.
 Kalinowski M. W., *Nonsymmetric Kaluza–Klein (Jordan–Thiry) Theory in a general nonabelian case*, Int. Journal of Theor. Phys. **30**, p. 281 (1991).
 Kalinowski M. W., *Nonsymmetric Kaluza–Klein (Jordan–Thiry) Theory in the electromagnetic case*, Int. Journal of Theor. Phys. **31**, p. 611 (1992).
- [2] Kalinowski, M. W., *A Warp Factor in the Nonsymmetric Kaluza–Klein (Jordan–Thiry) Theory*, hep-th/0306157.
- [3] Trautman, A., *Fibre bundles associated with space-time*, Rep. of Math. Phys. **1**, p. 29 (1970).